Applicant : Surendra Goel et al.
Serial No. : 09/917,675
Filed : July 31, 2001
Page : 17 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-194001 / Search 11

REMARKS

In response to the Office action of December 30, 2005, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the following remarks. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-21, 23, 24 and 26-80 are pending, with claims 1, 20, 43, 44, 62 and 80 being independent.

The Office action indicates that claims 1-43 are pending. However, applicant notes that claims 3, 6, 22 and 25 were cancelled, claims 44-80 were added, and claims 1, 20 and 43 were amended in an amendment filed on January 25, 2005. Furthermore, the amendment filed on January 25, 2005 was referred to in a Request for Continued Examination that was filed on May 25, 2005. The RCE was filed because the appeal brief deadline with a five-month extension of time expired on May 25, 2005. At that time, the Examiner had indicated that the amendment filed on January 25, 2005 had not yet been forwarded to the Examiner's docket, and thus the Examiner would not be able to act on the amendment before the period for filing the appeal brief expired. See Request for Continued Examination filed May 25, 2005 at page 1. A complete listing of claims is provided at page 2 of this paper for the Examiner's convenience.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-21, 23, 24, and 26-43

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 7 and 26. Claims 1-6, 8-25, 27-38 and 43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,527 B1) in view of Bharat (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,440 B1). The cancellation of claims 3 and 6 in the amendment filed on January 25, 2005 renders the rejection of claims 3 and 6 moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for performing a search for both local electronic content and remote electronic content based on a single query. The method includes receiving a single query that includes at least one search term. The method also includes simultaneously comparing the received search term automatically in response to the single query with indexed electronic content that is stored on a local device to derive a first result and comparing the

Applicant : Surendra Goel et al.
Serial No. : 09/917,675
Filed : July 31, 2001
Page : 18 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-194001 / Search 11

received search term with electronic content that is stored on a remote device to derive a second result. The local device is a personal computing device. The method further includes combining the first result and the second result into an amalgamated result and displaying the amalgamated result.

With respect to claim 1 and its dependent claims, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Singhal, Bharat nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests simultaneously comparing a received search term automatically in response to a single query with indexed electronic content that is stored on a local device to derive a first result and comparing the received search term with electronic content that is stored on a remote device to derive a second result, where the local device is a personal computing device, as recited in claim 1.

The Office action recognizes that Singhal "fails to explicitly disclose comparing the received search term automatically in response to the single query with indexed electronic content that is stored on a local device to derive a first result and comparing the received search term with electronic content that [is] stored on a remote device to derive a second result." See Office action of December 30, 2005 at page 3. The Office action instead relies on Bharat for this feature.

Bharat describes a search engine that modifies relevance rankings for a set of documents based on an interconnectivity of the documents in the set. See Bharat at col. 2, lines 32-35. More particularly, Bharat describes searching for, and ranking, web documents. See Bharat at col. 3, lines 8-13 and lines 19-27. Bharat describes a search engine, stored on a server device, that is configured to locate web pages relating to a particular topic in response to a search query from a user. See Bharat at col. 1, lines 45-56 and col. 3, lines 4-5 and 8-10. The search engine of Bharat includes a document locator and a ranking component. See Bharat at col. 3, lines 10-12. The document locator finds a set of documents having content that matches a user search query and the ranking component further ranks the located set of documents based on relevance. See Bharat at col. 3, lines 12-15. More particularly, the document locator locates web pages, or web documents, that are <u>stored at other devices or systems connected to a network</u>, such as a

database connected to the server device. See Bharat at col. 2, lines 57-60, col. 3, lines 8-10 and 19-22 and Fig. 1, particularly element 130.

As such, Bharat describes a search engine that locates documents, in response to a search query from a user, where the documents are located at a server device (i.e., a remote device) rather than at a device that is local to a user, such as a client device. The server device of Bharat is not local to a user in that it is connected, by a network, to a client device that is associated with, and is local to, a user, as shown in Fig. 1 of Bharat. Thus, instead of comparing a received search term with electronic content that is stored on a local device, as the Office action asserts, the search engine of Bharat compares a search query received from a user with documents that are stored at a remote device.

As such, Bharat does not remedy the failure of Singhal to describe or suggest simultaneously comparing a received search term automatically in response to a single query with indexed electronic content that is stored on a local device to derive a first result and comparing the received search term with electronic content that is stored on a remote device to derive a second result, where the local device is a personal computing device, as recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, neither Singhal, Bharat nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests this feature of independent claim 1. For at least this reason, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 8-19, 39 and 40.

Applicant also notes that the Office action does not address the recited simultaneously comparing the received search term with indexed electronic content that is stored on a local device to derive a first result and comparing the received search term with electronic content that is stored on a remote device to derive a second result. This feature was added to independent claim 1 in the amendment filed on January 25, 2005. Because neither Singhal, Bharat nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests such simultaneous comparing, the rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims should be withdrawn for this additional reason.

Applicant : Surendra Goel et al.
Serial No. : 09/917,675
Filed : July 31, 2001
Page : 20 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-194001 / Search 11

Independent claim 20 recites a computer program for performing a search for both local electronic content and remote electronic content based on a single query in a manner corresponding to that of independent claim 1, and independent claim 43 recites a system for doing the same. Accordingly, for at least the reasons noted above with respect to independent claim 1, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 20 and 43 along with claims 21, 23, 24, 27-38, 41 and 42, which depend from claim 20.

Claims 44-80

Applicant further notes that the Office action does not address claims 44-80, which were added in the amendment filed on January 25, 2005.

Independent claim 44 recites a method for performing a search for both local electronic content and remote electronic content based on a single query. The method includes receiving a single query that includes at least one search term. The method also includes comparing the received search term automatically in response to the single query with indexed electronic content that is stored on a local device to derive a first result and, at a separate time, comparing the received search term with electronic content that is stored on a remote device to derive a second result based on a single input action by a user. The local device is a personal computing device. The method further includes combining the first result and the second result into an amalgamated result and displaying the amalgamated result.

As described above, neither Singhal, Bharat nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests this feature. For at least this reason, claim 44 and its dependent claims 45-61 are believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 62 recites a computer program for performing a search for both local electronic content and remote electronic content based on a single query in a manner corresponding to that of independent claim 44, and independent claim 80 recites a system for doing the same. Accordingly, for at least the reasons noted above with respect to independent claim 1, claims 62-80 are believed to be allowable.

Applicant : Surendra Goel et al.
Serial No. : 09/917,675
Filed : July 31, 2001
Page : 21 of 21

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-194001 / Search 11

Conclusion

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fee is believed due. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/29/06

John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40335221.doc